United Nations

A/49/PV.16

# General Assembly

Forty-ninth Session

*Official Records*

**16**th Meeting
Tuesday, 4 October 1994, 10 a.m.
New York

*President:* Mr. Essy ..... (Côte d'Ivoire)

*The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.*

**Address by Mr. Ali Hassan Mwinyi, President of the United Republic of Tanzania**

**The President** *(interpretation from French):* The Assembly will first hear an address by the President of the United Republic of Tanzania.

*Mr. Ali Hassan Mwinyi, President of the United Republic of Tanzania, was escorted into the General Assembly Hall.*

The President *(interpretation from French)*: On behalf of the General Assembly, I have the honour to welcome to the United Nations the President of the United Republic of Tanzania, His Excellency the Honourable Ali Hassan Mwinyi, and to invite him to address the Assembly.

**President Mwinyi**: I wish to join my fellow Heads of State who have spoken before me in congratulating you most sincerely on your well-deserved election as President of the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly. As a distinguished son of Africa, you bring to this high office valuable experience, diplomatic skill and wisdom, all of which equip you superbly well to lead this Assembly - an assembly in which the faith and hopes of our people are reposed. Let me assure you, Mr. President, of Tanzania's whole-hearted cooperation and support as you execute your noble and immense responsibilities to humanity.

I should also express the great appreciation which my delegation feels for the dedication to duty and great leadership displayed by your predecessor, His Excellency Mr. Samuel Insanally of the Republic of Guyana, who very ably led the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly to its successful conclusion.

I wish also to acknowledge the untiring efforts of another son of Africa, our Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, who, together with his Secretariat, has continued to serve our Organization very well indeed. The Secretariat needs, and deserves, the support of all Member States in facing the challenges of their day-to-day work, often under very trying circumstances.

This is my second appearance before a session of the General Assembly since being elected President of the United Republic of Tanzania in 1985. I had the honour to address the forty-second session of the Assembly on 8 October 1987. I used that occasion, as the new President of my country, to reaffirm our faith in the United Nations and our commitment to the principles of the United Nations Charter.

Today, I am addressing this Assembly for the last time as President of my country. As members may well know, Tanzania has embarked on extensive political and economic reforms, which are proceeding very well, in peace and in harmony.

94-86525 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum. When the result of a recorded and/or roll-call vote is followed by an asterisk, see annex to the record.

As part of the political reforms, the constitutional term of a president is limited to a maximum of two five-year terms. My second and last term, therefore, will come to an end towards the end of next year, a time when we will hold our first general elections under a multiparty democratic system. It is my great wish that I should bequeath to the Tanzanian people a functioning democratic system that will allow them to choose their own leaders in a free and fair atmosphere.

As I prepare to pass on the baton of the leadership of my country to someone else, I can only reaffirm the faith and confidence my country has always had in the United Nations system. All its imperfections notwithstanding, the United Nations remains the only hope for poor and weak countries like mine, for it is only through the United Nations that we can raise our concerns for human development, world peace, justice and equality without fear. The imperfections of the United Nations system have nothing to do with the principles set forth in the United Nations Charter; rather, they are a product of the action or inaction of the Member States.

In this connection we are pleased to extend to all the new Members a warm welcome and sincere congratulations. Their admission has brought us much closer to our cherished goal of universal membership of the United Nations. We pledge to continue working closely with all nations to make our world a much better place for all humanity.

During my time as President of Tanzania, fundamental changes have occurred in the world. Some of these changes have given us reasons for hope; others have not. Our hopes that the post-cold-war era would bring a new impetus in our Organization for peace and development in all corners of the world have not yet been realized. The so-called peace dividend is not reaching those who need it most, that is, the poorest sectors of humanity. It is a pity that global tensions have been replaced by regional and national conflicts, with devastating consequences for innocent men, women and children. Whether on development questions or security issues, the developing countries, which constitute the vast majority, have seen little respite following the end of the cold war.

The collective security system envisaged under the United Nations Charter has not always worked to the satisfaction of many Members. This is because some Member States have, in the past, been reluctant to implement both the letter and the spirit of the Charter. Instead, loopholes and pretexts have often been used to justify action contrary to the spirit of the Charter. Today, as we approach the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, we all need to rededicate ourselves to the goals and ideals embodied in its Charter. This includes the need to make the United Nations and all its organs more representative of all its Members and more democratic. It is both hypocritical and a mockery of the ideal of democracy that some Members should preach democracy to the rest of the world and yet not accept the full democratization of the United Nations system.

This matter is particularly urgent in this post-cold-war world era. The emerging new power relations in the world can be either an asset or a liability, depending on whether all Members have the political will to enhance the representative nature and the democratic traditions of this world body. If such political will exists, I am sure we can make rapid progress on the expressed desire of many Member States to look again at the role, powers and membership of the Security Council. I am equally sure that if we all have the political will to reform the United Nations system for the better, we can quickly agree on enhancing the powers of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council. It is these two organs that are important agents in focusing our Organization on the real and urgent issues confronting the overwhelming majority of humanity.

In his comprehensive report to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session, the Secretary-General drew our attention to the peace-keeping role of the United Nations in the changing international context. While United Nations peace-keeping and peacemaking responsibilities have been on the increase, the means to implement those responsibilities have hardly kept pace with these new requirements. With more than 80,000 civilian and military personnel serving in 17 peace-keeping operations worldwide, the Organization requires new commitment towards meeting the costs involved.

We should all strive to honour our financial obligations as assessed to meet United Nations peace-keeping expenses. We must not reach the point where training and deployment of personnel will be undertaken only by those Member States who can afford such expenses on their own. Such an eventuality will not only make peace-keeping the monopoly of a few rich countries but will also deal a fatal blow to our cherished principle of universality of participation. In this connection, we entirely support the proposal made by Canada last week in this Assembly for the establishment

of a permanent United Nations peace-keeping force. This idea has been with us for a long time, and now is the time to act.

My delegation takes this opportunity to salute all United Nations personnel in the field for their devotion to duty and their perseverance under increasingly dangerous situations. Many, including Tanzanians, have died in action. We mourn them. Many more have been wounded. They deserve our heartfelt sympathy. The safety and security of United Nations personnel must continue to be a priority, and we support every initiative taken to establish an international treaty for their protection.

As a neighbour of both Rwanda and Burundi, Tanzania has found itself deeply involved in the search for peace and reconciliation in those two most troubled countries. Last year in Cairo, we, the African Heads of State, decided that the time had come for Africans to take charge of preventing, managing and resolving conflicts in their continent, for our countries may be poor, but our poverty does not extend to the realm of humanity, dignity and wisdom.

In both Rwanda and Burundi, there was a time when our hopes rose high, when we thought that at last a permanent solution had been found to their endemic problems. In the case of Burundi, the high point was the election of July 1993, which was declared by international observers to have been free and fair. The transition of power from President Buyoya to the late President Ndadaye was equally impressive. That man, whom the people of Burundi had chosen to lead them, personified not only hope for peace, unity and reconciliation in Burundi, but also the dawn of a new era of peace, stability and cooperation in our subregion.

But some people in the military establishment decided to put their private and parochial interests above the wishes of the ordinary people of Burundi. What the Burundi people got through the ballot was taken away by the bullet. The attempted coup that followed in October 1993 resulted not only in the death of President Ndadaye but also in the death of many innocent people of Burundi. No one knows exactly how many died; estimates range from 100,000 to 200,000. But statistics alone are unimportant, as not a single life should have been lost in the first place; above all, behind these cold statistics are real people - husbands and wives, sons and daughters, all of whom perished leaving behind widows and widowers, as well as orphans.

In addition to those who died, over 700,000 others fled their country in order to save their lives; about 500,000 of them fled to Tanzania alone. Another 200,000 or more were displaced internally. With those events of October 1993, our hopes for peace and reconciliation in Burundi were dashed to the ground; since then we have been waiting anxiously for new developments that could rekindle our hopes.

We are encouraged by the efforts of moderate elements in Burundi to create a transitional government of unity, based on the concept of power sharing. It is incumbent upon those of us neighbouring Burundi and upon the international community as a whole to support and encourage the Government of President Sylvestre Ntibantunganya during this transitional period.

In the case of Rwanda, the event that gave us hope was the signing of the Arusha Peace Agreement on 4 August 1993. The Agreement provided a comprehensive framework for the permanent solution of the political and security problems in Rwanda. But the Agreement, which had been so painstakingly negotiated, was held hostage by those who were keen to protect their own interests rather than the interests of the ordinary citizens of Rwanda. For eight months, the timetable agreed upon for the implementation of the Arusha Agreement was not followed. The only transitional institution provided for in the Agreement was the presidency. The death of President Habyarimana, therefore, denied us the only legal transitional authority in Rwanda at that time. Then began the worst carnage in African history - which, even as I speak, is still claiming the lives of innocent people, not to mention having been the cause of over 1.5 million refugees in neighbouring countries. Most of those who participated in the Arusha negotiations on behalf of the then Rwanda Government were massacred.

Following its military victory, the Rwandese Patriotic Front (RPF) established in July 1994 a fairly broad-based Government of National Unity. Tanzania was among the first countries to recognize this new Government. We recognize and appreciate the efforts and good intentions of this new Government to restore peace in Rwanda, to rebuild State institutions and to bring about genuine national reconciliation. In particular, we encourage and support all efforts of the Rwandese Government to create conditions within Rwanda that will give Rwandese refugees the confidence to return home as soon as possible. Rwanda needs to revert to a state of normalcy as soon as possible. A country from which its own citizens run away to save their lives cannot be

normal. Even as I speak, some Rwandese refugees continue to enter Tanzania. This means that the Rwandese people, especially the Hutus, still feel insecure - whether for valid reasons or as a result of the propaganda war waged by the ousted regime and its agents.

In this connection, the Government of Rwanda needs the encouragement and practical assistance of the international community to restore essential services and to re-establish the rule of justice and law and order. The traditional discipline within the ranks of the RPF needs to be maintained, and individual acts of vengeance must be contained. Innocent Hutu refugees must feel secure and confident that no reprisals will be meted out to them for previous atrocities associated with their tribe. On the other hand, all those guilty of the genocide in Rwanda must face justice. In this respect, we urge the United Nations, in collaboration with the Rwandese Government, quickly to make operational the international tribunal that will investigate and put to trial all those suspected of committing these atrocities. This, we hope, will reduce the motivation for individual acts of revenge.

The urgency of stemming the tide of refugees, and of effecting their subsequent repatriation, is of paramount importance. The refugee camps must not be allowed to acquire the character of permanency, as this would create an environment conducive to the political and even military mobilization of the refugees. In the meanwhile, we who are hosts to these refugees have a duty to disarm them and take whatever action is necessary to make it impossible for them to be mobilized, whether for political or military purposes.

Neighbouring countries and the international community should also warn the deposed regime and its army not to entertain thoughts of a military return to power. We cannot allow another chapter of this tragedy to be written in the history of Rwanda. For, as an English political philosopher, Edmund Burke, said two centuries ago:

> "The use of force alone is but temporary. It may subdue for a moment; but it does not remove the necessity of subduing again; and a nation is not governed, which is perpetually to be conquered."

In this connection, I wish to emphasize the need for the Rwandese Government to proceed on the basis of the framework of the Arusha Peace Accord, which in my view remains the best hope for a permanent solution to the problems facing that country. As Facilitator to the peace process in Rwanda, I wish to commend the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), Dr. Salim Ahmed Salim, and the OAU Secretariat for the outstanding commitment they have shown to the resolution of this problem, despite the many disappointments along the way. I also wish to use this opportunity to thank the United Nations, as well as Belgium, Burundi, France, Germany, Senegal, Uganda, the United States of America and Zaire, which acted as observers to the Arusha peace negotiations.

I wish also to thank the United Nations agencies and all Governments and non-governmental organizations that joined hands with my Government in providing relief to the Rwandese refugees in my country. But the relief work is far from being over; new refugees are still coming in. The local communities which have hosted the refugees need to be compensated for the food and other services and supplies they have shared with them. The environmental damage caused by the huge and sudden influx of refugees also needs to be addressed as soon as possible.

The people of Ngara district in Tanzania have themselves been forced to live like refugees in their own country. The local population has been outnumbered by the refugees by a ratio of one to two. They face overcrowding in social service centres and endure tremendous price hikes, sometimes reaching 300 per cent over a short period, for all their requirements. And to this must be added increased security risks and criminality.

As for environmental damage, the influx of refugees into Ngara and Karagwe in Tanzania, between April and June 1994 alone, caused a loss of 18,000 tons of trees, with an estimated value of $12 million. The 400,000 refugees living in Ngara have since April consumed 200 tons of firewood daily, with far-reaching consequences for the environment. The international community needs to continue to be seized of this matter and increase its support to those of us hosting this huge influx of refugees.

It is only honourable for us as Members of the United Nations to accept that the role of our Organization in Rwanda has been far from honourable, and has been quite contrary to the principles of our Charter. While aid agencies and non-governmental organizations can do wonders on the ground, Governments wring their hands and wait for one another to lead the action. The crisis in Rwanda was made worse by political indecision within

the international community. My delegation can only agree with the OAU Secretary-General that, by our failure to act promptly, we too stand to be blamed for the loss of innocent lives and the suffering of an entire people.

African troops pledged at the OAU Summit in Cairo last June should quickly be given the necessary logistic support to enable the redeployment of the United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR) at its full strength to start without undue delay. The enlarged UNAMIR should then create safe zones along the Zairian and Tanzanian borders, which should be fully stocked with relief supplies so as to encourage refugees to enter these safe zones as a first step towards returning to their own homes.

Since my country became a member of this Organization, there has perhaps been no issue before this Assembly which has preoccupied us like the question of decolonization and the struggle against the apartheid system in South Africa. It is therefore a matter of tremendous satisfaction to us that decolonization is now almost complete and that apartheid has finally landed where it belongs - in the dustbin of history. South Africa's return to the membership of the United Nations is a victory for all the people of that country, whatever their colour, a victory for the United Nations and certainly a victory for the international community as a whole.

The political and economic reintegration of South Africa into the rest of Africa is one of the biggest triumphs for Africa for many years. We in the southern African subregion are happy that at last our people can sleep peacefully without fearing a surprise attack or a destabilization campaign from South Africa. We are happy that the emerging peace and security in our region can now release scarce resources for the development of our people. On the economic front, we have quickly begun to reverse the years of disengagement from South Africa and to work together to integrate our economies through the Southern African Development Community (SADC), in which the new South Africa will play a very important role.

This, unfortunately, does not mean that all our problems in southern Africa have been resolved. Events in Angola continue to cause us a good deal of anxiety. Through its endless intransigency, UNITA continues to create problems for the Angolan peace talks in Lusaka under United Nations mediation. I think the time has come for the international community to exert final pressure on UNITA to stop it from continuing to obstruct these peace efforts. We must not forget that the MPLA party won the elections sponsored by the United Nations in September 1992. Yet, regardless of its victory, the MPLA has been generous in inviting UNITA to join a government of national unity. We cannot see why certain foreign Governments should continue to pamper UNITA as it comes up with new excuses to delay the process of national reconciliation in that country. Our Organization should tell Mr. Savimbi that he cannot have his own way forever. We therefore call upon all those with influence on Mr. Savimbi to ask him either to cooperate or face the consequences of the full sanctions promised in resolution 932 (1994).

In Mozambique, thanks to the determined efforts of the Secretary-General and the United Nations Operation in Mozambique (ONUMOZ), most of the difficulties have since been overcome. We look forward with anticipation to the national elections later this month in the hope that they will not only be free and fair, but also that all parties will respect and abide by the election results. We hope that the lessons from the Angolan experience have now been learned well and that the people of Mozambique will be spared the menace that Mr. Savimbi continues to present in Angola. We commend, in particular, the outstanding goodwill and generosity of the Government of President Chissano, which was demonstrated throughout the negotiating process.

Despite overall economic growth in the world, and the creation of numerous developmental and social institutions, poverty has been on the increase in most parts of the developing world, particularly in Africa.

A supportive international environment is crucial if we are to attain sustained economic growth in developing countries, especially in the least developed ones. The United Nations must be able to play a much greater role in this matter because, unlike the Bretton Woods institutions, the United Nations is universal; its programmes operate everywhere; and it does not ignore countries. But I must add that the United Nations has to be strengthened, as mandated by its Charter, to enable it to play a complementary role *vis-à-vis* the other international organizations involved in development.

Most of the least developed countries, including Tanzania, remain among the most debt-distressed countries. It is true that the magnitude of our debt is marginal by international standards. Indeed, the indebtedness of the least developed countries does not have a substantial effect on the international financial

system. But in relation to the size of their economies, the debt burden is far too heavy and constitutes a major obstacle to sustained growth. In the light of an already grim financial flow situation, caused by declines in official development assistance, the crippling burden of international debt has seriously hampered development prospects for most of our countries.

As an illustration, if we in Tanzania were to apportion our total national debt of $6.3 billion to each of our citizens, every poor man, woman and child would be indebted to our rich creditors by the equivalent of their total earnings for over two years. Put differently, even if the Tanzanian Government were to devote all its foreign exchange earnings to paying off this debt, it would still take us over 12 years to do so. With a debt burden of this magnitude dragging us down all the time, it will be difficult for our economy to take off.

There is an urgent need for the international community to adopt a unified and coordinated approach towards a durable solution of the external debt position of countries like mine if we are serious about reducing poverty in the world. To achieve this, there should be a full cancellation of all bilateral and official debt, as well as a substantial reduction of the debt stock and the debt service burden owed to multilateral financial institutions and commercial creditors.

Nowhere in the world today are the social conditions more desperate and calling for more urgent attention than in the least developed countries. Declining income aggravates poverty and threatens the social fabric of entire societies.

It is our hope that the forthcoming World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen will be an important forum for the world community to focus on the social and developmental concerns of developing countries in an attempt to free them from the vicious circle of poverty.

The protracted Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) finally came to a conclusion in December 1993. We then met at Marrakesh, Morocco, on 15 April 1994, to sign the new agreement that establishes the World Trade Organization. We from the developing world, and especially those of us from Sub-Saharan Africa, signed that agreement not because we were happy with it or because we thought it took care of our interests. We signed it because the alternative was equally tragic. In truth, this new agreement will only mean the entrenchment of poverty in our countries unless compensatory measures are urgently taken in our favour.

It is already being estimated that Africa is the only continent that will actually lose rather than gain from this new agreement. Sub-Saharan Africa is expected to lose about $2.6 billion a year by the beginning of the next century. The cause of this loss is largely the entrenchment of unfavourable terms of trade, and the opening up of African markets to transnational corporations based in the rich countries, which will now have wider and unhindered access to markets in Africa and elsewhere. We will therefore continue to demand better terms of trade for our products in international trade, as well as preferential treatment where this is felt to be necessary.

It is now two years since we assembled at Rio de Janeiro to bring to its conclusion the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. The implementation of the agreements reached at that world summit has been extremely slow and in most areas non-existent. The world is still far from the concept of sustainable development. The Agenda 21 document remains an academic masterpiece while the issues involved remain unresolved. Among other things, the United Nations, through the Commission on Sustainable Development, should assume a major role in helping developing countries to build their indigenous capacities in science and technology and in promoting access to existing technology on favourable terms.

We are none the less gratified that the desertification Convention has been concluded. This is a great relief for the 900 million people world wide affected by this phenomenon. We look forward to the signing of the Convention later this month.

We commend our development partners that supported the negotiations on this important Convention for Africa. The African annex to the Convention contains our commitments to implement the programmes of action in an effort to contain the processes of desertification and drought, which are exacerbated by poverty and underdevelopment. Unless there is a serious commitment by developed countries and multilateral financial institutions to extend the financial resources required to implement the Convention, the social and economic consequences of desertification and drought will be irreparable.

We welcome the timely initiative taken by the Secretary-General in preparing the Agenda for Development. The Agenda provides an appropriate framework for dealing comprehensively with the interrelated issues of economic and social development, the environment, peace, justice and democracy. Development is a shared concern of all nations and the acceptance of this fact by the entire international community will result in great success in dealing with this Agenda.

While we recognize that States must assume responsibility for their own socio-economic development, we must also recognize that this will be increasingly difficult without the assistance of the international community. The solutions to the problems created by poverty, rural-urban migration, the degradation of the environment and the complexity of the refugee situation will require an integrated approach. It is our hope that the Agenda for Development will project a coherent strategy for achieving a new and inclusive vision of world development. Such a strategy must bind all countries, both small and large, rich and poor, in a planned and implementable programme for human progress.

Tanzania attaches great importance to the full and effective participation of developing countries in decision-making for the resolution of economic problems facing our common planet. In addition, the Agenda should incorporate the various agreements and strategies for international development already adopted over the years in different forums and conferences. We must also identify the reasons why so many of these commitments and agreements, especially those related to developing countries, are still on paper only.

In conclusion, I wish to reiterate our faith in and commitment to the United Nations. In this post-cold-war era, the temptation to bypass, or dictate to, this world body might be quite high. We must not allow that to take place. We must instead work to strengthen the United Nations and its agencies and to entrench their democratic tradition. We must, at the same time, recognize that poverty, like the environment, knows no borders. It is in our collective interest that, as we celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations system, we dedicate ourselves in practical terms to the eradication of poverty the world over. We must agree that poverty is as much a threat to peace and security and as much an affront to humanity as injustice, oppression and discrimination.

**The President** (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the President of the United Republic of Tanzania for the statement he has just made.

*Mr. Ali Hassan Mwinyi, President of the United Republic of Tanzania, was escorted from the General Assembly Hall.*

**Programme of work**

**The President** (*interpretation from French*): I should like to draw the attention of members of the Assembly to document A/49/452, containing a letter addressed to me by the Chairman of the Fifth Committee concerning the proposed revisions to the medium-term plan for the period 1992-1997.

I should like to ask Member States to submit, in writing, their views on programme 6 of the medium-term plan no later than Wednesday, 26 October, for transmittal to the Fifth Committee as soon as possible.

**Agenda item 9** ***(continued)***

**General debate**

**The President** (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Prime Minister of the Principality of Andorra.

*Mr. Oscar Ribas Reig, Prime Minister of the Principality of Andorra, was escorted to the rostrum.*

**The President** *(interpretation from French)*: I have pleasure in welcoming the Prime Minister of the Principality of Andorra, His Excellency Mr. Oscar Ribas Reig, and inviting him to address the General Assembly.

**Mr. Ribas Reig** (Andorra) (*spoke in Catalan; English text furnished by the delegation*): Your election, Sir, to the presidency of the forty-ninth session of the Assembly marks an important moment for your country, Côte d'Ivoire, and for the entire African continent. I have the honour to convey to you the warmest wishes of the people and Government of Andorra. I also take this opportunity to express appreciation of the great accomplishments of your predecessor, Ambassador Insanally.

I am speaking before you here only a few hours before the official opening of the Permanent Mission of the Principality of Andorra to the United Nations, the first diplomatic Mission of Andorra anywhere in the world. This Permanent Mission is the embodiment of the will of the Andorran people to participate actively in the implementation of the ideals of the United Nations Charter.

On the eve of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of this Organization, our Mission will work towards the achievement of important goals. For one thing, it will make careful preparation for the World Summit on Social Development to be held in Copenhagen. The objectives of that Summit - namely, to find ways to reduce poverty, enhance employment opportunities and strengthen social integration - are particularly important in relation to the new possibilities for development under consideration by the Secretary-General in his "Agenda for Development". For another thing, Andorra will take part, with the greatest interest, in the work of the Third Committee, whose activities support our historic devotion to respect for human rights. I wish also to take this opportunity to acknowledge the commendable work of the new United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Ambassador Ayala Lasso.

As president of the United States, John Fitzgerald Kennedy stood before the Berlin Wall and pronounced that famous phrase, "*Ich bin ein Berliner*" ("I am a Berliner"). And for people everywhere in the world who listened to him on that historic occasion, the word "*Berliner*" was understood to mean "a defender of freedom".

For those countries whose culture expresses itself in the Catalan language, a similar moment has become equally historic. I speak of the day when the distinguished musician and universally recognized artist Paul "Pablo" Casals boldly affirmed, here at the General Assembly of the United Nations, before Secretary-General U Thant: "I am Catalan". Everyone understood immediately that, with these words, he was beginning a song of liberty and declaring himself to be the son of a people filled with respect for others, a people who had created one of the oldest parliamentary and democratic systems in the world, as he stated in his dedication to the cause of peace. Let us remember that the hymn of the United Nations, the Hymn to Peace, is his work, and that it was played for the first time, with lyrics by the poet W. H. Auden, on 27 October 1971.

Allow me today to humbly join two such important and respected figures and proclaim, in the same spirit and with the same passion, "I am an Andorran". And I hope that this expression will have the same meaning for you as the earlier assertions, and not seem to be a childish and self-centred show of pride, for throughout the centuries our ancient and small State has always demonstrated its love of freedom, its will to contribute to balance and harmony, and its concern to maintain peace.

It has been a little more than a year since Andorra became a Member of the United Nations, following the approval of our Constitution and the full adaptation of our model of statehood to that befitting a State under modern law. Because of this, and because of the fact that we are the last of the four small, historically independent European States - the others being Liechtenstein, San Marino and Monaco - to have become Members of the United Nations, it seems that this is an appropriate occasion on which to reflect on the possible contributions of micro-States to the family of nations.

It is evident that in a world in which great operations must be performed on a grand scale, the simple fact of our existence might appear anachronistic or irrelevant. Indeed, at a time when the establishment of the World Trade Organization points towards the end of protectionism, and the North American Free Trade Agreement, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Council, and the European Union herald the creation of large areas in which there is free circulation of goods and services, one might well question the need for the continued existence of a number of small States which often find themselves surrounded, as in our case, by large supranational entities such as the European Union.

Yet I believe that as we move towards integration, it becomes more than ever necessary to respect and preserve the identities of micro-States. It is clear that these identities are not measured in terms of size, nor do they allow for the subordination of a minority within a majority, of a smaller collective identity within another that is demographically larger.

As democracy consists of government by the majority and the respect of minorities, on the international stage the politics of large blocs and of great Powers must be compatible with the recognition of groups which, though smaller, must not be relegated in any way to a status that is discriminatory nor must they be considered less than what they are.

It is evident that all small States - and probably a quarter of those represented here are small States in one

way or another - have clear limitations. It is evident also that the contribution of great Powers to the establishment and the preservation of world order is, and must be, decisive. But it is also true that, beyond their limitations, small States have qualities that humanity cannot do without, especially at the present time when many peace and reconciliation processes have not been resolved and remain in need of great generosity, comprehension, tolerance and a will to compromise.

By their very nature, micro-States must, in an intrinsic and essential way, have respect for diversity and mutual harmony. Precisely because of their small size, they have learned in the long course of history that durable solutions cannot be imposed, and that the core of the differences cannot be eliminated. More powerful States can gain useful knowledge from their experience, built upon a wisdom that only centuries can provide. This is even more pertinent today, when the great Powers have begun to show a certain self-restraint, having discovered that while the use of force might postpone a conflict, it cannot be the basis for a lasting solution. May the great Powers of the world be guided by the rules of conduct that micro-States have been compelled to adopt, and may the necessity of the small be the virtue of the large. To propose rather than impose, to negotiate rather than to compel, to discuss rather than dictate, to reconcile rather than radicalize, to respect rather than humiliate, to cooperate rather than exploit, and to refrain rather than abuse: those are the rules of conduct dear to the small States, characteristics which appear to be increasingly necessary in many regions of our planet, if what we want is for the people of the world to live together in dignity and fight together against hunger, poverty, disease and the negative effects of the demographic explosion.

It is for this reason, that I venture to call the attention of the members of the Assembly to the virtues of the micro-States and to ask them to consider whether they might not make them their own. It is simply a question of the great nations making an imaginative effort to put themselves in the place of those who possess neither military power nor human and economic resources to impose on others, and consequently to realize that problems may be approached in another way, with probably better guarantees for a successful outcome.

This approach finds its origin in the strictest respect for the identity of others, of their collective personality and all the features that contribute to it, as well as their culture; for culture is always an element of integration. And it is precisely the balance of cultures and their interaction which is the basis for peaceful coexistence, which is in itself considerable, and even more for a cordial and fraternal life together. Let us therefore forget the worries of assimilation and the belief in the superiority of the majority, and let us try to organize life together with mutual respect, something that becomes increasingly important in a world under great pressure from demographic change and immigration.

Allow me to refer to my country, the Principality of Andorra, which with a population of only 61,000 inhabitants has three different educational systems - Andorran, French, and Spanish - three quarters of its population being immigrants, and a small territory stuck like an island in the middle of the European Union. And I believe that a study of some of the balances that exist in Andorra might be useful to efforts in southern Africa, in the Middle East, or in other parts of Europe and the world where people are struggling to bring about peace.

Think, likewise, of the great worries of our times, where the drug trafficking and organized crime have led to a dramatic deterioration in urban safety. Members might agree with me that the affirmation "small is beautiful" might appear excessive, but it nevertheless guarantees a level of security far greater than that which exists in the enormous urban conurbations of more developed countries.

I should like further to call the Assembly's attention to the urgency of the task of protecting the environment, and the defence of nature. Members might agree with me that a smaller territory is much easier to manage, according to environmental criteria, and consequently that there is less chance of environmental abuse. In the same way, the scarcity of human resources probably makes us more inclined to consider the problems that we shall discuss at the World Summit on Social Development in Copenhagen, namely, individual problems of marginalized people, of those that cannot follow the competitive majority in the apparent flow of progress, of the disabled, the sick, and, in general, all those in need of solidarity. I know that in a forum such as this Christian individualism is just a partial approach to these questions, but I am convinced that, with a translation into other cultures or religions, on a small scale it is much easier to give a personal answer to the problems of the many. And also, in general terms, I think that this philosophy is the one that often inspires solidarity movements, as is the case today in Rwanda, where, for example, the spirit of collective life common to small communities might have prevented conflict.

In a world that is increasingly interdependent, and increasingly globalized, I sincerely believe that the micro-States, although indeed small, are not superfluous. And we can even make useful contributions and be points of reference in many cases. Sovereign States are increasingly affected by the sovereignty of others and by necessary international agreements; but freedom, and the spirit of solidarity are more important than sovereignties or borders.

I ask the Assembly therefore to consider the possibility that we all make an effort to act like micro-States: we who are micro-States, and therefore have no alternative, and those who are not, because they have come to the conclusion that this is the way we will all be able, together, to contribute more positively to peace, progress and coexistence. And as from the sum of small streams of water the big rivers are born, perhaps from the sum of small identities and from respect for others and minorities, we may be able to build together a more equitable, a more secure and a more livable world for us, for our children, and for generations to come.

**The President** (*interpretation from French*): On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Prime Minister of the Principality of Andorra for the statement he has just made.

*Mr. Oscar Ribas Reig, Prime Minister of the Principality of Andorra, was escorted from the rostrum.*

**The President** *(interpretation from French):* The next speaker is the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Pakistan, His Excellency Sardar Aseff Ahmad Ali, on whom I now call.

**Mr. Ali** (Pakistan): The Pakistan delegation congratulates you warmly, Sir, on your election to preside over this important for -ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly. Your election is a fitting tribute to your experience and outstanding achievements. It is also an expression of the high regard in which the international community holds your great country. We are confident that under your able stewardship this Assembly will succeed in advancing the noble aims and objectives of our Charter.

I wish also to record my delegation's profound appreciation for your predecessor, Ambassador Samuel Insanally of Guyana. He presided most ably over the Assembly as well as over the important Working Group on Security Council reforms.

The principal purpose of this world Organization is "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". The United Nations must ensure that the twilight of the twentieth century is not as bloody as was its dawn. We must act resolutely to end the series of regional conflicts that currently threaten international peace and stability.

The civil war in Afghanistan has compounded the suffering imposed on its people during the long and victorious struggle against foreign occupation. The world community should not forsake the Afghan people. We must continue to demand an immediate end to the hostilities. We must promote a new political consensus for the future governance of Afghanistan. To facilitate this, we must commence reconstruction in the peaceful parts of the country.

We welcome the temporary truce in Tajikistan. Pakistan hopes that the preliminary steps agreed will be implemented by the parties. This is essential to ensure the success of the third round of United Nations-sponsored talks, to be held in Islamabad later this month.

The United Nations must encourage the peaceful resolution of the Cyprus issue on the basis of a bi-communal and bi-zonal federation, in which the Turkish Cypriot and the Greek Cypriot community would have equal status.

The Security Council must act, under Chapter VII of the Charter, to implement its own resolutions, reverse the Armenian aggression and restore the unity and territorial integrity of Azerbaijan.

We all bear a collective responsibility for the failure to halt and reverse Serbian aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina. A holocaust has taken place before the eyes of the world. Two hundred thousand Bosnians, mostly Muslims, have been killed. Of them, 30,000 were innocent children. Forty thousand Muslim women have been systematically raped by the Serbs. Millions of Muslim men, women and children have been ejected forcibly and brutally from their homes.

While the aggression was going on, the major Powers went through the motions of promoting peace. The Security Council adopted 50 resolutions, but it has yet to implement them. Mediators appointed by the United Nations and the European Union advocated peace plans that rewarded the aggressor and penalized the victim. Even the right to self-defence has been denied to

the Bosnians. The United Nations Protection Force has supervised relief but failed to stop the war or protect the Bosnian people. It was only when the North Atlantic Treaty Organization carried out - belatedly - the threat of air strikes that the Serbs halted their onslaught against Goradze and Sarajevo.

The Bosnian Serbs have rejected the peace plan, which is, in truth, unjust to the Bosnian Muslims. It does not entirely reverse "ethnic cleansing". It does not punish the aggressor. It does not ensure the territorial integrity of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Bosnia should be offered peace with justice, otherwise peace will not endure.

Pakistan and other Islamic countries are appalled at the Security Council's recent decision to ease the sanctions against Belgrade - the root cause of the aggression against Bosnia and Herzegovina. This will not stop the flow of military supplies to the Bosnian Serbs. It will merely encourage Serbian intransigence.

The Bosnian Muslims must be allowed to exercise their right to self-defence. Pakistan and other Islamic countries fully support the demand for the immediate lifting of the arms embargo against Bosnia and Herzegovina. We regret the threats by certain countries to withdraw their troops from the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) if the embargo is lifted. The Islamic States will be ready to contribute their troops to UNPROFOR to compensate for any shortfall created by such withdrawals. We call for vigorous steps by UNPROFOR to effectively protect and provision Sarajevo and other safe areas. We also urge the creation of exclusion zones around all safe areas.

If expansionism is not stopped in Bosnia, if genocide is not punished, the virus of war will spread to Kosovo, to Sandjak and perhaps to the entire Balkans. A wider conflict in this volatile region could have the most serious consequences for peace and security in Europe and the Mediterranean.

A grim and bloody struggle is also going on in Jammu and Kashmir. As in Bosnia, it is an unequal struggle - between the defenceless Kashmiri people and an Indian occupation force that now numbers 600,000. In Kashmir, as in Bosnia, the principles of the Charter, of international law and of international morality have been violated with impunity.

The struggle of the Kashmiri people is just and legitimate. They were promised by the United Nations Security Council - and by India and Pakistan - that they would decide, through a United Nations-supervised plebiscite, whether they wished to join India or Pakistan. On 26 June 1952, the late Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, stated in the Indian Parliament:

> "If, after a proper plebiscite, the people of Kashmir said, 'We do not want to be with India', we are committed to accept that ... we will not send an army against them".

But India has gone back on its agreement. It refuses to implement the Security Council resolutions. It has sent its army against the people of Kashmir. It has chosen to crush the Kashmiri freedom movement by brute force. Over the past five years, 40,000 Kashmiris have been killed; thousands more are in Indian jails. Thousands of Kashmiri women have been raped by Indian soldiers as part of a policy to break the spirit of the Kashmiri people. Whole villages and neighbourhoods have been put to the torch. Torture is routine; disappearances are common; and summary executions are standard practice in Kashmir.

India's massive violations of human rights have been well documented by impartial organizations and observers, such as Amnesty International, Asia Watch, the International Federation of Human Rights, the International Commission of Jurists, Physicians for Human Rights and many others. The world knows about Indian barbarism in Kashmir. It is unfortunate that the world has remained silent so far.

When faced with the possibility of censure by this Assembly last year, India offered to resume talks with Pakistan on Kashmir. In the talks held last January, India displayed no desire for a settlement. It repeated the fiction that Kashmir was an integral part of India. The Indian Foreign Secretary told us that India had the right to use as much force as it wanted to prevent Kashmir from breaking away. When the issue was raised at the Commission on Human Rights, India offered cosmetic concessions to prevent the dispatch of a United Nations fact-finding mission to Kashmir. Thereafter, it denied it had made such a deal.

On the ground as well, India escalated its repression as soon as international pressure was eased. The day after we agreed to resume talks, India conducted a massacre in Sopore, killing 50 Kashmiris. Once India had concluded that the major Powers would overlook its human rights violations because of the lure of trade and

profits in India, the repression against the Kashmiris and the rhetoric against Pakistan sharply escalated.

Let me quote from the conclusions of the latest report of Human Rights Watch/Asia, entitled: *India: Continuing Repression in Kashmir* (August 1994, vol. 6, No. 8)

> "As this report amply illustrates, the human rights situation in Kashmir is getting worse at a time when international pressure on the Indian Government has all but ceased. Indeed, it could be argued that the increase in deaths in custody and other abuses over the last six months is not unrelated to the signals sent by India's one-time critics, notably the United States: that human rights would no longer feature prominently in bilateral discussions". (p. 20)

I have seen the statement made here yesterday by the Commerce Minister of India. While I can fully subscribe to the high ideals which he has propounded, I find myself in the same situation as the distinguished philosopher the late Mr. Bertrand Russell, when he observed that

> "When one observes that the high idealism of the Indian Government in international matters breaks down completely with the question of Kashmir, it is difficult to avoid a feeling of despair".

India preens itself and postures on the issue of terrorism. Terrorism is the use of indiscriminate violence against innocent people. This must be condemned. By this yardstick, India is guilty of daily and systematic acts of terrorism against the Kashmiris. On the other hand, to resist a foreign invader, to repel an army of occupation engaged in murder, torture, rape and arson is not terrorism. It is the exercise of self-defence. Self-defence is a right as old as history; a right recognized in the United Nations Charter. Distinguished representatives: If your son was killed, and his body was thrown on your doorstep, how would you respond? If your daughter was gang-raped by the soldiers of an occupation army, what would be your response? The Kashmiri people have the right - under international law, under our Charter, under our resolutions - to resist the Indian army of occupation by all the means at their disposal. Their heroic struggle cannot be dismissed as terrorism. It is a valiant freedom movement which deserves the full support of the international community.

Pakistan is a party to the Kashmir dispute. Our people are incensed at India's brutal killing of our Kashmiri brothers and sisters. We have, nevertheless, acted with restraint. We have extended moral, political and diplomatic support to the Kashmiris.

*Mr. Blandino Canto (Dominican Republic), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

We have refrained from extending military help to them. The Indian allegations of Pakistan's support for the so-called militants are designed to explain away the resilience of the Kashmiri freedom movement, to erode international sympathy and support for the Kashmiris and, more ominously, to create perhaps a *casus belli* for a new aggression against Pakistan.

The Kashmir crisis poses a growing threat to international peace and security. On India's independence day this year, Prime Minister Rao demanded all of Kashmir. In recent months, Indian politicians and generals have threatened to launch attacks across the Line of Control. India's violations of the cease-fire have escalated. During August alone, the United Nations Military Observer Group for India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) recorded 142 complaints from Pakistan of Indian cease-fire violations. Indian firing across the Line of Control is specifically aimed at civilians. In the past five years, over 600 civilians have been killed on our side of the line. Pakistan's self-restraint should not be misunderstood. Indian aggression will have disastrous consequences.

There are three priorities in addressing the Kashmir question: first, to avert the threat of a conflict; secondly, to ameliorate the suffering of the Kashmiri people; and, thirdly, to open a credible diplomatic process designed to achieve a just and peaceful solution to the Kashmir dispute.

To arrest the threat to peace, I have addressed a letter to the President of the Security Council proposing that the United Nations Military Observer Group for India and Pakistan should be substantially enlarged from its present size of 35 observers. UNMOGIP should be allowed to perform its mandate of patrolling both sides of the Line of Control. This would help to stem cease-fire violations, lower tensions and avoid the danger of a conflict. The enlarged United Nations Observer Group could also ascertain the veracity of India's allegations that Pakistan is providing military assistance to the Kashmiri struggle. I hope that the Security Council will approve our proposal. I hope that India will allow the United Nations Observers to discharge their mandate of patrolling on both sides of the Line of Control.

Secondly, to ameliorate the suffering of the Kashmiri people, India should take some genuine steps to halt its repression. We note with satisfaction that concern about opinion at this Assembly has convinced India to release at least two of the imprisoned Kashmiri leaders. This is a victory for the Kashmiri freedom struggle. These aging and ailing leaders will, we hope, be allowed to proceed abroad for medical treatment. Shabir Ahmed Shah, who, like Nelson Mandela, has spent 20 years in prison because of his commitment to freedom, has not been released. The world community must demand the release of this prisoner of conscience.

There is no evidence that India has given up its repressive strategy in Kashmir. This will become visible once India lifts the Draconian emergency laws operative in Kashmir, releases all the Kashmiris detained in Indian jails, withdraws a part of its huge force from Kashmir, and allows human rights organizations and humanitarian agencies free access to the occupied Valley of Kashmir. And we hope the international community will not forget the victims of Indian atrocities. As in Bosnia and Rwanda, the human rights violations which have been documented and reported by impartial agencies must be investigated by an international tribunal, and those who are found guilty must be punished.

Finally, the efforts to promote a political settlement of the Jammu and Kashmir dispute must take into account three realities.

First, the Kashmiri freedom struggle cannot be crushed by force. New Delhi's forecasts of imminent success are designed to deceive the Indian public and world public opinion. The Indian army is caught in a quagmire.

Secondly, despite India's assertions about Pakistan's interference, the Kashmiri struggle is obviously indigenous. The Line of Control in Kashmir has 400 soldiers per kilometre. The Indians have wired and mined the Line. Nothing can get through. United Nations monitoring of the Line can verify this. No external force can convince the Kashmiris to offer the kind of sacrifices being made by Kashmiri men, women and children in the cause of freedom. For five years the Kashmiris have sustained their struggle. They will continue their struggle even if Pakistan wishes otherwise.

Thirdly, no credible Kashmiri group or leader accepts a "solution" for Kashmir within the Indian Union. The so-called political process advertised by India is wishful thinking. The All Parties Hurriyat Conference, which groups 34 Kashmiri political parties and organizations, has rejected any settlement short of freedom from India.

Arriving in Srinagar after his release two days ago, Abdul Ghani Lone said:

> "Any elections to be held in Kashmir are to be under the auspices of the United Nations and ... only for the right of self-determination".

The other released Kashmiri leader, Syed Ali Shah Ghani, said:

> "Elections are no answer to the problem in Kashmir. The people of the State do not accept anything short of freedom. There will be no compromise in the fight for self-determination".

India's attempt to organize another fraudulent election in Kashmir will prove abortive. As the Security Council declared in 1957, such unilateral actions cannot be considered as the basis for the "final disposition" of Jammu and Kashmir. This can only be done through a United Nations-supervised plebiscite prescribed by the Security Council. A final settlement of the Kashmir dispute will have to be based on the freely expressed wishes of the Kashmiri people. In a paper transmitted to India last February, Pakistan outlined the possible modalities for ascertaining their wishes.

Pakistan welcomes the Secretary-General's offer to exert every possible effort to "facilitate the search for a lasting solution to the Kashmir issue" (A/49/1, para. 542). We hope India will also accept the Secretary-General's offer of good offices, as Pakistan has done. Pakistan is prepared for talks with India on Kashmir. It was Pakistan which initiated the Foreign Secretary-level talks. But after six rounds of talks it is evident to us that India's ostensible desire for negotiations with Pakistan carries little credibility while it continues the killing in Kashmir. Pakistan does not reject dialogue, but it must not be a dialogue of the deaf.

Kashmir is a dispute between India and Pakistan. Every dispute between two States is bilateral. It is also an international issue. The United Nations is obliged to take cognizance of such disputes, specially when they involve violations of the United Nations Charter and the non-implementation of Security Council resolutions.

Kashmir is the key to unlocking the problems of South Asia. Kashmir cannot be brushed aside any

longer. The conspiracy of silence must be broken. A resolution of the Kashmir situation is required to avoid the danger of a conflict. A solution of the Kashmir dispute will also enhance the prospects of conventional arms control and non-proliferation in South Asia.

My Government believes that to reduce the danger of war in South Asia it is essential to promote a balance in conventional arms between Pakistan and India, at the lowest possible levels. India fields the third largest army in the world. Almost all of it is deployed against Pakistan. During the past decade India was the world's largest arms importer. Even during the Afghan war, India's arms acquisitions were over five times those of Pakistan. Pakistan's defence capabilities have deteriorated further since 1990. Last year, while Pakistan's defence spending declined in real terms, India's increased by 20 per cent.

Pakistan has made several proposals to India for conventional arms control: negotiation of a mutually agreed ratio of forces; measures to prevent the possibilities of a surprise attack, adoption of agreed principles for conventional arms control in South Asia.

Pakistan has no desire to expend more of its scarce resources on arms. Meaningful arms control and confidence-building measures could also help to stem the danger of a nuclear arms race in our region.

Pakistan's concern about nuclear proliferation in South Asia precedes the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). As early as the mid-1960s Pakistan had warned the world that India would misuse nuclear cooperation. The late Prime Minister Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto proposed the creation of a South Asia nuclear-free zone in 1972. In May 1974 India exploded the bomb - ironically calling it the "Smiling Buddha". Pakistan made every endeavour to counter proliferation in South Asia. Apart from the nuclear-weapon-free zone, we advanced subsequent proposals: for the simultaneous signature of the NPT by India and Pakistan, for acceptance of full-scope safeguards, for joint renunciation of nuclear weapons, for a bilateral test-ban treaty. All have been spurned by India. A proposal made by the United States for a conference to promote non-proliferation in South Asia, involving Russia, the People's Republic of China and the United States, as well as India and Pakistan, was also rejected by New Delhi.

Pakistan has displayed responsibility and restraint in the nuclear field. While we have acquired a certain technological capability, we have not manufactured or exploded a nuclear device. We have not deployed nuclear weapons. We have not transferred sensitive technologies.

Twenty years after exploding its nuclear bomb, India is about to take another fateful step towards proliferation: the production and deployment of nuclear-capable ballistic missiles. India is continuing work on its medium-range AGNI missile as well as on intercontinental ballistic missiles. It conducted user trials of the short-range Prithvi this year. The Prithvi is a mobile missile. Once it is produced, Pakistan will have to presume that it has been deployed.

*The President returned to the Chair.*

It is still not too late to prevent nuclear-weapon proliferation in South Asia. Pakistan suggests two critical steps to avoid this danger.

First, we suggest an agreement between India and Pakistan not to develop or deploy ballistic missiles. India's production and deployment of the Prithvi will invite a matching response from Pakistan. We have advanced the concept of a Zero Missile Zone in South Asia. This objective should be endorsed by the world community.

Secondly, we suggest an agreement between India and Pakistan not to manufacture or deploy nuclear weapons. We hope India will respond positively to this longstanding proposal. We hope it will agree, as a first step, to issue a joint declaration with Pakistan renouncing nuclear weapons.

It is unfortunate that India and Pakistan have never succeeded in solving any of their disputes through bilateral negotiations. Agreements reached on two major problems - the Indus Waters Treaty and the Rann of Kutch Accord - were made possible by the intercession of a third party.

At this critical moment, when tensions are high and peace is threatened in South Asia, the States Members of the United Nations have a fundamental responsibility to bring to bear their collective influence to promote solutions to the interlinked problems of Kashmir, conventional arms conflict and non-proliferation.

Pakistan desires good-neighbourly relations with India. We want our people to devote their energies to the vital task of nation-building. We want to banish from our midst the spectre of rampant poverty. We want our people to live with dignity. These goals cannot be attained unless we resolve the Kashmir problem and others and build a climate of trust and confidence in South Asia.

Pakistan has embarked on a new path of socio-economic revival and growth. We have released the dynamism of our private sector. We have created an economic climate that is most hospitable to domestic and foreign investment, and the results have been most gratifying. Agreements for foreign investment of $4 billion were concluded 10 days ago with a delegation led by the United States Secretary of Energy. Additional investment is likely in the energy, telecommunications, electronics and other dynamic sectors of the Pakistan economy.

Today, Pakistan and all of South Asia have the chance to break out of the cycle of poverty and underdevelopment. We must not lose this chance. We must not let history pass us by again.

We meet on the eve of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations. The end of the cold war has released both positive and negative forces that were long suppressed. The principles of democracy, human rights and free markets have triumphed. We have celebrated the entry into the United Nations of many new States, proud and free. The victory of democracy has been achieved in South Africa. The victory of peace may well be realized in the Middle East. Today, there is no threat of a global nuclear war. Unprecedented affluence has been achieved in parts of the world. Momentous technological breakthroughs have been made. We now have the potential to achieve global peace, address global problems and promote global prosperity.

But even as we celebrate these victories, the triumphs of reason and statesmanship, we must confront the dark forces of aggression, racism, fascism and bigotry, which have again raised their head in many parts of the world.

It is, perhaps, not surprising that once the restraints of the cold war structures were lifted, conflicts and disputes - between States and within them - should have erupted like an epidemic. The world community has been unprepared to confront and repel aggression - witness Bosnia, Azerbaijan and Kashmir. We have been unable to muster the political will to stop genocide - witness Rwanda. We are unprepared to pay the price to help the hungry and save the deprived of the Earth - witness the Sahel.

The principal task of this session must be to revive hope, to restore the confidence of our peoples, that we, the States Members of the United Nations, acting together, can build peace where it is broken; that we can bring solace to those who are suffering; that we can uphold and enforce justice where this is needed; and that we can enlarge the horizons of prosperity to embrace those teeming millions who are imprisoned in poverty.

**Address by His Royal Highness Prince El Hassan Bin Talal, Crown Prince of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan**

**The President** (*interpretation from French*): The Assembly will now hear a statement by the Crown Prince of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

*His Royal Highness Prince El Hassan Bin Talal, Crown Prince of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, was escorted to the rostrum.*

**The President** *(interpretation from French):* I have great pleasure in welcoming the Crown Prince of Jordan, His Royal Highness Prince El Hassan Bin Talal, and inviting him to address the General Assembly.

**Prince El Hassan Bin Talal**: It is my pleasure, at the outset, to congratulate you, Mr. President, on your election and to wish you and the members of the Bureau every success in the discharge of your duties. Your election is a mark of the confidence and high regard in which both you and your country are held by the international community. Your wisdom and your forbearance will be crucial to the successful outcome of the current session.

I should like to express deep appreciation for the exemplary manner in which your predecessor conducted the work of the Assembly during his tenure last year. I also wish to express my gratitude to the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros-Ghali, for his tireless efforts to enhance the Organization's ability to meet the challenges of a rapidly evolving world.

It is gratifying to observe that the membership of the United Nations now encompasses several recently independent States. We share bonds of religious and cultural affinity with some; we share friendships and mutual respect with all. We hope that the principle of

universality, which has always been the cornerstone of the United Nations, will soon encompass the remaining peoples and regions, so that this Organization can truly represent the collective conscience of mankind.

It is, I believe, fitting to extend heartfelt congratulations to President Nelson Mandela, to Vice-President Frederik De Klerk, and to the people of South Africa. They have together established a new order in their country, one founded on justice and equality. The world rejoices at the return of South Africa to the fold of the international community of nations. The South African people have proved that peace is always possible, so long as all are given the chance to participate in its building. This is a theme that bears consideration.

As we approach a landmark in the history of the United Nations - the fiftieth anniversary of its foundation - it is appropriate to look forward rather than back; to take stock of things to come rather than things past. It is appropriate to consider the shape that our global order is taking.

South Africa offers a new paradigm, a fresh vision for a changing world. It shows us that a new order must have room for everyone. We must be able to listen to all voices: to the weak and the powerful alike. A new order must be inclusive and must actively encourage participation at every level: for in our ever- more interdependent world, the future of one is the future of all. This, I believe, goes to the very heart of global peace.

We are called upon, then, to articulate a new approach. We must protect the rule of law, but we must go further, and ensure that democracy, pluralism and respect for human rights come to govern the life of nations. We must evolve new procedures of cooperation, communication and accommodation. We must promote social responsibility, national commitment and international obligation. Nations must learn to coexist with their neighbours; but more than this, they must learn to work willingly together as partners in the enterprise of peace.

Such a transformation is taking place in the Middle East. My region has been synonymous with conflict and war for decades. At last we have an historic opportunity to resolve the Arab-Israeli conflict, and to fashion in its place a new commonwealth of peace, hope and participation for all.

The question of Palestine has been Jordan's main concern. Family ties, geographic contiguity, and shared history and traditions ensure that this is so. Over the years, Jordan has extended support and encouragement to our Palestinian brethren. Our contributions and sacrifices to the Palestinian cause from 1948 onwards have been widely acknowledged. My country has received successive waves of refugees and returnees, at a huge cost to our economy, imposing an impossible burden on our limited resources. Yet we remain committed to our democratization process, to the protection of civil liberties and human rights, and to the provision of decent living conditions and services for all our citizens. Underlying this commitment is our belief that broad-based popular involvement in civil society is fundamental to its health. This is why Jordan has been able to weather the ravages of war, to survive the long years of turmoil in our region.

If Jordan has been on the front line of war, so too has it been on the front line of peace. In those well-known words of Security Council resolution 242 (1967), which my country helped to draft, Jordan has always worked steadfastly for a just, lasting and comprehensive peace in the Middle East. We promoted the genesis of the current process with the Madrid Conference of 1991. When the Israeli Government of the day refused to negotiate with the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), Jordan stepped into the breach, helping the Palestinians to assume their proper role by providing an umbrella for their participation.

Now the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, is negotiating directly with Israel. They are installed in Gaza and Jericho, and conduct their affairs as they see fit: their destiny is at last in their own hands. Jordan welcomes these developments, and will continue to do everything in its power to ensure the success of Palestinian autonomy arrangements.

On the Jordanian-Israeli track, our common agenda has paved the way for us to agree upon modalities in areas such as water, the environment, energy, territory, borders and regional security. These agreements resulted in the meeting between His Majesty King Hussein and Prime Minister Rabin of Israel, on 25 July 1994, at which they signed the Washington Declaration. This historic document ended the state of war between Jordan and Israel. I myself have just held constructive talks with President Clinton and Foreign Minister Peres, the goal of which is to build a framework of trilateral development as well as an economic equilibrium in the region, and to maintain the momentum towards peace.

Jordan and Israel are engaged in substantive talks, seeking just and mutually agreeable solutions to the outstanding issues listed in our common agenda. Our aim is to conclude a treaty of peace based on solid grounds that can withstand the winds of change. Such a treaty, we believe, will delineate our rights and duties under conditions of peace. It will open the door to cooperation at the regional level, so that the benefits of peace may be enjoyed by our peoples. It has always been Jordan's vision that the Middle East, cradle of civilization and birthplace of the three great monotheistic religions, should be a region of cultural tolerance and mutual interdependence.

Important as our bilateral talks with Israel may be, we are keenly aware that no two nations stand alone. Our aim remains a comprehensive peace. Many of the issues we are currently addressing defy the confines of bilateralism and require regional and international participation.

One such issue concerns the spiritual significance of the city of Jerusalem. For believers in the three great monotheistic faiths, Jerusalem must be the ultimate symbol of peace and its glorious manifestation. A final settlement on the political and administrative status of the city, however, will occur in negotiations between Palestinians and Israelis. Any arrangement reached must serve the needs of the millions of followers of Islam, Christianity and Judaism.

The economic dimension of peace is likewise a transnational concern. The economies of the Middle East have been shattered by the conflict. They must be revived if peace is to take root on the ground. Access to more equitable opportunities for economic growth will be vital. International debt relief and write-off strategies should be planned, encompassing improved concessionary terms by the Clubs of Paris and London.

But the States of the region must also play their part. Restrictions on trade should be relaxed. We must develop a non-discriminatory approach to sustainable development and economic well-being. We hope that the Middle East-North Africa Economic Summit at Casablanca will build on the achievements of the Regional Economic Development Working Group and prove a useful forum to explore the potential partnership between Governments, private businesses and international financial institutions - for this partnership surely holds the key to the economic future of the region.

International changes wrought by the end of the cold war have affected the political situation in the Middle East as elsewhere. The transformation of world power politics has been accompanied by a shift in attitude, modifying the cost benefit calculus of regional States. National strategic objectives can no longer be sought at the cost of others in a supposedly "zero sum game". In the context of a regional security regime, the size, the role and the function of the armed forces in individual States of the region are likely to undergo radical changes. These will favour peace-keeping functions, allowing scarce resources to be released for development needs.

In this context, Jordan fully supports the five dimensions of world peace and security outlined by the Secretary-General. I would like to add that Jordan supports the ongoing effort to streamline the United Nations, and fully endorses the attempt to increase the number of permanent members on the Security Council. We also support the American proposal that peace-keeping operations be strengthened by additional personnel, more effective field capabilities, greater cooperation between the United Nations and participating countries and a more united approach to training.

Here again, Jordan is at the forefront of change. Our armed forces as peace-keepers under the United Nations command as far afield as Georgia, Angola and the former Yugoslavia value the opportunity to take part in these missions, for in a very real sense, they allow us to participate in the unfolding world order. Jordan is proud to be involved in shaping global security arrangements.

As the peace process develops, it will be necessary to promote a common regional identity and a shared regional vision. All the Middle East must contribute to the articulation of this vision. The key, again, is participation. If the countries and peoples of the region have a say in shaping its future, they will have a stake in its success. And success will accordingly be all the more likely; for the diversity of our region is a positive asset that we must learn to use creatively. We will inevitably differ on certain issues, just as we will agree on others. But we must be able to discuss our views in the knowledge that they will be heard, for honest communication is the basis of genuine involvement in any joint enterprise.

In this spirit, Jordan feels honour-bound to register its concern over threats to the process of global reconciliation. Inertia must not be allowed to dominate the conduct of world affairs. Deep-seated conflicts will not disappear by themselves. We urge the international

community of States to take swift action to facilitate their resolution.

One glaring example is the ongoing situation in Bosnia Herzegovina. The appalling practices of "ethnic cleansing" and genocide continue even as we speak. My country abhors these atrocities. Jordan supports all the international community's efforts to end this tragic and wasteful conflict, and we have taken positive steps to alleviate the hardship it has caused. Jordan has joined the Non-Aligned Movement's task force on Bosnia. Our soldiers, who form the second largest contingent of the United Nations peace-keeping effort in the Balkans, are engaged in both humanitarian relief and peace-keeping duties. Jordan has supported the Vienna and Washington Agreements to establish a federation between the Muslims and Croats of Bosnia, and has welcomed the peace plan advanced by the Contact Group, supported by the G-7 summit in Naples. The Serbian challenge to the plan, in the face of Muslim and Croat acceptance, is cause for deep disappointment.

I turn now to the situation in the Gulf. The importance of stability and security cannot be overstated. International norms must be observed; the territorial integrity of all States must be preserved. Their sovereignty and political independence must be upheld on the basis of non-interference in their internal affairs. My country also wishes to reiterate its serious concern for the plight of the people of Iraq, where living conditions are deteriorating rapidly. We intend to do our utmost to alleviate the suffering of the Iraqi people, so far as is consistent with the provisions of United Nations resolutions.

The distorted image of Islam remains a cause for grave concern. The attention of this body should be turned to the spreading of Islamophobia, or hate for Muslims. This phenomenon occurs in all manner of ways, from the purely verbal to the bluntly physical. Its proponents deal in inflammatory rhetoric. They preach the inevitability of cultural apocalypse, tarring all Muslims with the brush of fanatical extremism. They ignore the fact that Islam is a broad and adaptable concept and institution. One billion Muslims now live on this earth. Thus, Islam encompasses all shades of political opinion, different patterns of theological thought, and countless varieties of human experience.

Jordan urges Member States to join forces in bringing about a better understanding of Islam as a religion, a culture and a civilization. The expression of anti-Muslim sentiment, and other manifestations of Islamophobia, should be monitored and combated by educational campaigns, cultural exchanges and similar endeavours. We have always advocated an interfaith dialogue as the surest way to combat bigotry and stereotyping.

More than a decade ago now, I stood before this Assembly and called, on behalf of my country, for a new international humanitarian order. That led to the establishment of the Independent Commission on International Humanitarian Issues. The Commission was charged with investigating a wide range of pressing humanitarian issues. It performed its duties well, producing a series of reports that made clear the scale of the impending global humanitarian disaster.

It would be comforting to stand before this Assembly today and tell it that its work has made a significant difference. It would be comforting, but it would not be true. A new international humanitarian order has not come into being. The powerless remain powerless. The dispossessed have not recovered their birthrights. There are more refugees, more street children, more innocent victims of conflict than ever before. What is worse, these issues are still addressed in a piecemeal fashion. It is often said that one should not try to treat a mass of symptoms, but to seek out root causes. Remarkably, it sometimes seems that far from seeking causes we are doing our best to ignore the symptoms.

Today, I have tried to address causes. I have spoken of the fundamental need for participation at all levels. I have put before the Assembly a vision of a global order characterized by partnership and communication, tolerance and trust. In some places this vision is on the road to realization; in others, it has seldom been more remote. The alternatives are very clear, and the choice is ours.

I pledge my country's full support to this Organization, for as we move towards the twenty-first century, and as the Organization moves towards its fiftieth anniversary, the ideal that inspired the Charter of the United Nations has never been more important.

**The President** *(interpretation from French):* On behalf of the General Assembly, I wish to thank the Crown Prince of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan for the statement he has just made.

*His Royal Highness Prince El Hassan Bin Talal, Crown Prince of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, was escorted from the rostrum.*

**The President** (*interpretation from French*): I now call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, His Excellency Mr. Ali Alatas.

**Mr. Alatas** (Indonesia): It gives me great pleasure to extend to you, also on behalf of the Indonesian delegation, our congratulations on your election as President of the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session. We are gratified that the stewardship of this session is entrusted to a seasoned diplomat and statesman, representing a fraternal African country with which Indonesia has traditionally enjoyed close relations of friendship and cooperation.

May I also express our deep appreciation to your distinguished predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Insanally of Guyana, for so capably guiding our work during a most eventful year.

I join other members in paying tribute to the Secretary-General for his determined efforts to resolve various conflict situations across the globe and his endeavours to make the United Nations a more efficient and effective instrument of global governance in these challenging times.

We meet at a time of pervasive change and transition, a time in which global problems appear less susceptible to easy solutions, earlier concepts and approaches less relevant and existing institutions less effective. It is also a time of contradictions and paradoxes in which resurgent hopes are nurtured amidst deepening anxieties and bright new opportunities are overcast by unprecedented challenges in a world that is coalescing and fragmenting at the same time.

The euphoria which permeated the international community at the end of the cold war has dissipated and is being replaced by a growing sense of uncertainty, disquiet and disillusionment. With the sobering experience of the Gulf war and the horrendous incidence of "ethnic cleansing" and violence in the former Yugoslavia, Somalia and Rwanda, there is far less certainty now on how best to respond to the demands and vicissitudes of a world of deepening interdependence among countries and the globalization of ever more intricate and inter-linked problems of peace, security and development. Our greatest challenge, therefore, is how collectively to fashion a more effective system of global governance to manage the massive changes that are transforming the shape and substance of international relations in the decades ahead.

If the pursuit of this basic objective is to succeed, there can be no doubt that it should be based on the recognition of the United Nations as its centre-piece and principal mechanism. The United Nations is the only universal institution we have today, and any system of global governance, to be viable and to achieve common acceptance by the world community as a whole, must be firmly rooted in the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter and organized on the precepts of sovereign equality, common interest and benefit, equitably shared responsibility and joint commitment to global cooperation.

It is therefore vitally important that the effectiveness and dynamism of our Organization be ensured and maintained. Since the United Nations was founded almost five decades ago, the world has changed almost beyond recognition, and international problems have become immensely more complex. The United Nations today bears a heavier load of responsibilities than it has ever borne. Ironically, at this time it is also saddled with a deepening financial crisis. This paradoxical situation, in which the United Nations is expected to deal with a multitude of problems while woefully strapped for funds, cannot continue without adverse consequences for the world community.

Just as important is the need to ensure that the United Nations system remains faithful to the democratic principles on which it was founded and attuned to the realities of the times. We therefore believe that the process of reforming the United Nations system should go beyond merely improving its procedures and practices and should, *inter alia*, take into account such essential aspects as the representation of Member States at all levels of the system and their effective participation in decision-making processes. The General Assembly should play a central role in shaping that process at the same time as its work is being continually rationalized.

On the question of an increase in the membership of the Security Council, my delegation has clearly defined its position on various occasions in the past. The last review of the Council's composition was undertaken nearly three decades ago. Since then there has been a tremendous increase in the number of United Nations Members, thus rendering the enlargement of the Council a matter of urgency. Such an increase should take into account the principle of equitable geographic

representation and accommodate the interests and concerns of the developing countries, which comprise the overwhelming majority in the Organization. Furthermore, my delegation supports the proposal to increase the number of permanent members of the Security Council. In this respect, it is our view that, while the principle of geographic representation is important, it should not be the only criterion to determine eligibility for new permanent members. We believe that other objective criteria are equally important: political, economic and demographic realities; a country's capability and record of contributing to the promotion of peace, security and economic development, both regionally and globally; and the commitment of States to assume the responsibilities inherent in such a status. In these endeavours our goals must remain the promotion of transparency, legitimacy, accountability and efficiency.

In the economic and social fields, as well as in development cooperation, it has been said that the United Nations system operates without sufficient coordination and coherence. However, in addressing this concern, we do not see the particular merit of a proposal for the establishment of an economic security council at this time. Rather, the Economic and Social Council should be further strengthened and should be allowed to assert its full role as envisioned in the United Nations Charter. In this regard, I think it would be productive to invite the Ministers responsible for finance and development planning, or other relevant Ministers, to participate in the deliberations on important development issues at the Economic and Social Council's high-level segment meetings. The United Nations should also continue to strengthen its coordination with the Bretton Woods institutions so as to achieve increased policy coherence and to enhance development cooperation.

Although the demise of the cold war has reduced the threat of nuclear war, it has not eliminated the danger posed by nuclear weapons. Nuclear disarmament remains an imperative. It is hoped that with further success in the critical area of limiting and reducing armaments, the quantitative growth of nuclear weapons will soon be curbed. Recent encouraging developments include a significant reduction of the world's two largest nuclear arsenals as a result of the successful conclusion of the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START II) and of the fact that a moratorium on nuclear tests continues to be observed by most of the nuclear-weapon States.

In this context, the importance of a comprehensive test-ban treaty as a major step towards nuclear disarmament and as an urgent measure to protect the environment cannot be overemphasized. For this reason, the Conference on Disarmament has been given a clear and explicit mandate to negotiate a comprehensive ban on nuclear testing. Unfortunately, lack of political will on the part of some nuclear-weapon States has created obstacles to progress in this vital work. It is essential that serious and concerted efforts be undertaken in the Conference on Disarmament in conjunction with the broader multilateral endeavours in the Amendment Conference on the partial test-ban Treaty to ensure the conclusion of a universal and effectively verifiable treaty within a fixed time-frame. Such a treaty, we believe, would serve as a truly credible instrument of a nuclear non-proliferation regime.

The convening of the 1995 review and extension Conference on the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) provides a unique opportunity to make a sober assessment of its implementation. It is beyond doubt that the question of the extension of the NPT is linked to such critical issues as nuclear disarmament, the dissemination of nuclear know-how for peaceful purposes, security assurances to non-nuclear States and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Hence, the issues we face next year should not be oversimplified to a mere choice between limited and unlimited duration or between conditional and unconditional extension of the NPT. The longevity of the Treaty will ultimately depend upon the resolution of these multifarious issues and the sincerity of the nuclear-weapon States in fulfilling their obligations.

Regional and subregional organizations continue to make substantial contributions to the cause of disarmament and peace. In the Asia-Pacific region, the Regional Forum of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) was launched last July in Bangkok, reflecting the desire of the countries of the region to ensure a peaceful and stable political and security environment for their peoples. This forum is unique because it was not established in response to a crisis but, rather, as an exercise in preventive diplomacy to manage strategic change in such a way that a stable relationship among the major Powers as well as among the regional Powers will evolve gradually and peacefully over the next decade. At the same time ASEAN is intensifying its efforts to realize its blueprint for a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality with a South-East Asian nuclear weapon-free zone as its component part. Its realization would be a major step towards stable peace in the region

and a significant regional contribution to global disarmament and non-proliferation.

Although the Asia-Pacific region now enjoys relative peace, it is by no means free of tension and the anxiety of potential conflict. Among the actual and potential problems that the region must face is the persistence of inter-State disputes, especially territorial disputes and overlapping claims of sovereignty which could intensify if their potential for conflict were not effectively managed. That was why in its Manila Declaration of 1992, ASEAN stressed that its Treaty of Amity and Cooperation should serve as a basis for the establishment of a code of international conduct in the area and thus called for the peaceful settlement of disputes and the non-use of force. The positive response of the major Powers and of the countries of the region towards the Treaty serving as such a code of conduct at the first meeting of the ASEAN Regional Forum makes it even more necessary to promote cooperative efforts among countries that have overlapping claims of sovereignty in the South China Sea in order to ensure the peaceful development of the area.

As regards the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula, the agreement reached last August between the Governments of the United States and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was a major step towards a resolution of this problem. We continue to believe that this complex issue can be resolved only through the exercise of mutual restraint and through sincere and sustained dialogue and negotiations.

In the Middle East, the pursuit of peace continues to gather momentum and promises to herald a new era. The historic Declaration of Principles signed between the Palestine Liberation Organization and the Government of Israel over a year ago has been followed by the Accord signed in Cairo last March, which laid down the modalities for transition to Palestinian self-government in the Gaza Strip and Jericho and thus paved the way for the triumphant return of President Yasser Arafat to these areas. Yet another breakthrough is the signing of the Washington Declaration between Jordan and Israel which ended the state of war between them and opens the way for the conclusion of a comprehensive peace treaty.

While my delegation welcomes these positive developments, we are also acutely conscious of the formidable challenges that still lie ahead. Palestinian autonomy should now be widened to include the economic, social and cultural aspects of national life, and Palestinian self-rule should now be extended throughout occupied Palestinian territories. Furthermore, the international community should expedite its promised assistance to the Palestinian Authority in rebuilding the necessary infrastructures. It is also self-evident that progress on the other tracks of Arab-Israeli negotiations is a *sine qua non* for a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East question on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) 338 (1973) and 425 (1978). The ultimate guarantee for peace is Israel's withdrawal from all occupied territories, including the Golan Heights and southern Lebanon.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the atrocities, senseless killings of civilians and "ethnic cleansing" perpetrated by the Bosnian Serbs have continued unabated. The pleas of the Bosnian Government for effective international intervention or at least the lifting of the ill-conceived arms embargo have gone unheeded. The savagery of the conflict has few historical precedents and the ambivalence of the international community has contributed to its perpetuation and the ever-present threat of a spill-over. By rejecting the latest peace plan proposed by the Contact Group, the Bosnian Serbs have dealt a serious set-back to international efforts to end the conflict.

*Mr. Piriz Ballon (Uruguay), Vice-President, took the Chair.*

The carnage cannot just go on. It is incumbent upon the Security Council to unequivocally pronounce itself on the non-applicability of resolution 713 (1991) concerning the imposition of an arms embargo on Bosnia and Herzegovina. Furthermore, in the face of the continued intransigence of the Bosnian Serbs, the Security Council must take strong and determined measures in order to ensure the realization of the peace plan. Concurrently, the international community should consider devising a mechanism for negotiations, including the convening of an appropriately structured international conference, to deal with the wider aspects of the conflict in and around the former Yugoslavia, leading ultimately to a comprehensive solution that would enable the people in that region to live securely in peace, free from aggression, domination and external interference.

Earlier this year, the people of South Africa finally put an end to apartheid by holding the first-ever non-racial elections and by subsequently installing the first, democratically elected government under President Nelson Mandela. We have all joyously welcomed this historic event as well as South Africa's resumption of its rightful place in the community of nations. Indonesia

looks forward to developing close and mutually beneficial cooperation with the new Government and the people of South Africa.

Elsewhere in Africa, however, we were deeply anguished to witness in Rwanda the rampage of violence which has triggered an exodus of refugees to neighbouring countries and has brought about a humanitarian crisis of catastrophic proportions. With the end of fighting and bloodshed and the establishment of the new government in Kigali, we hope that the parties concerned will resume the process of national reconciliation based on the Arusha Agreement, which indeed provides an appropriate framework for the purpose.

The situation in Somalia continues to be marked by recurrent outbreaks of violence and a deterioration of the security situation. We remain convinced that a solution to the civil strife in that country can only be achieved through sustained dialogue among all the parties, under the auspices of the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity (OAU). In this context, we hope for the early convening of the national reconciliation conference in accordance with the Declaration of last March by the leaders of Somalia.

The entry into force of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea next month represents the culmination of efforts begun over two decades ago to create a new order for the oceans. The Convention, which Indonesia ratified in 1985, will make a significant contribution in promoting the peaceful uses of the seas and in ensuring their equitable utilization.

I do agree with the report of the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Development" (A/48/935) when it cites the economy as being the engine of progress and of development as a whole. If I may carry the metaphor a little further, it may be appropriate to say that at present the world economy is a flawed engine that has stalled but is beginning to warm up again. It is flawed by the imbalances and inequities that have distorted one of its most important parts, the relationship between the developed and the developing economies. It has broken down in a long and devastating recession, but in recent times it has shown signs of recovery.

However, the aggregate statistics of world economic growth often conceal as much as they reveal. As aptly put by the 1994 World Economic and Social Survey, the world economy remains a complex mosaic of sharp contrasts, in which most developing countries are often too weak and too vulnerable to be able to compete successfully in the world market, thus risking their further marginalization and decline into extreme poverty. Hence, apart from the need to sustain non-inflationary, global economic growth, the urgent imperative continues to be the eradication of poverty and the acceleration of the socio-economic development of the developing countries on a sustained and sustainable basis.

If the engine for global progress and development is to carry mankind to a brighter future in the next century, then its parts must be brought into a more balanced, synergistic relationship and its functioning be made more effective and efficient. We have no alternative but to forge a new partnership for development involving all nations, developed and developing. It is therefore crucial that we bring to full realization General Assembly resolution 48/165 on the "Renewal of the dialogue on strengthening international economic cooperation for development through partnership". By adopting this resolution, the international community has acknowledged the indispensability of the principles of genuine interdependence, of mutual interest and benefit, and of equitably shared responsibility, in a new spirit of global partnership.

As a necessary corollary to this North-South partnership, South-South cooperation has become even more compelling, for the developing countries are called upon to shoulder an increasing share of the responsibility for world growth and development. We look forward to the report of the Secretary-General on this issue and also to the deliberations leading to the adoption of "An Agenda for Development".

As many advocated during the World Hearings on Development in June this year, as well as at the High-Level Segment Meeting of the Economic and Social Council, the Agenda should be action-oriented and should present an overall policy and priority framework for a balanced and comprehensive approach to development. It should reflect universal recognition and acceptance of the United Nations as the only Organization capable of dealing with issues of development as well as with issues of peace and security. It will also be necessary for the agencies, bodies and programmes of the United Nations to be organized in such a way as to enable them to implement the Agenda in an effective, efficient and coordinated manner, without necessarily creating a new body for this purpose. Obviously, there will be the need to generate the required political will in support of the Agenda. We look forward to seeing "An Agenda for

Development" serve as a fitting complement to "An Agenda for Peace".

One of the most important recent developments in the international economic sphere is the completion of the Uruguay Round with the signing of its Final Act in Marrakesh and the agreement to establish the World Trade Organization (WTO). Indonesia and the other developing countries have accepted the Uruguay Round package, in spite of the heavy obligations and challenges that it entails, because they anticipate that considerable opportunities for increased market access and indeed for world economic growth and prosperity will now be forthcoming. They also expect that the Uruguay Round package will provide the long-sought assurance of a rule-based and non-discriminatory multilateral trading system, free from the arbitrariness of unilateral action. Yet, we must confess to being concerned at the possibility of a tardy and long-drawn-out process of implementing the Final Act. Such an eventuality will negate much of its original intent and rob it of its positive impact, as was, regrettably, the experience with the Tokyo Round. Furthermore, the attempts to overload the WTO work programme with social clauses in our view represent protectionism in a thin guise and tend to nullify the few remaining comparative advantages of developing countries. For this reason we feel strongly that the process of ratification and implementation of the Uruguay Round agreements should not be linked to new issues that have little or no relevance to the development of a new international trading regime. All nations are called upon to marshal their political will and to accept inevitable shifts in comparative advantage without transferring the burden of adjustment to weaker economies.

Had relationships between developed and developing countries been more equitable, we would not today be faced with the problem of developing countries staggering under their external debt burden. While aggregate debt indicators have undoubtedly improved, mainly in response to various debt-relief measures, the external debt crisis still persists especially in the least developed countries where debt ratios have significantly worsened and continue to hamper the prospects for economic growth and development. A durable solution to the perennial debt question can only be secured through a development-oriented strategy formulated within the framework of shared responsibility and genuine partnership. Thus, rather than taking a one-sided view of the causes of external debt, there is an urgent need for all sides involved to adopt a coordinated approach.

As Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement, Indonesia has given the highest priority to resolving this crisis. President Soeharto took the initiative of conveying a memorandum on the debt of developing countries to the Chairman of the Group of Seven on the eve of their Tokyo Summit last year, inviting the G-7 to engage in dialogue on this issue. We are encouraged that the G-7 responded positively to the Non-Aligned Movement on this issue in Tokyo and then again last July in Naples, where, *inter alia*, it urged the Paris Club to pursue its efforts to improve the debt treatment of the poorest and most indebted countries and, where appropriate, to reduce the stock of debt as well as to increase concessionality for those countries facing special difficulties. Moreover, Indonesia has also recently hosted a ministerial meeting of non-aligned countries on debt and development, involving the most heavily indebted least developed countries. The meeting called upon the international community, particularly donors and international financial institutions, *inter alia*, to adopt a common set of principles for future debt negotiations, which include a once-and-for-all arrangement for settling all outstanding debts, and the application of debt reduction to all categories of debt, including multilateral debts. A report of the meeting has been submitted to the Secretary-General for possible consideration at this session of the General Assembly.

As a firm believer in the rights of peoples to development, including social development, Indonesia is deeply committed to participating actively in the World Summit for Social Development. The World Conference on Women in 1995 equally deserves total support from the international community. Indonesia is committed to the adoption of a conference declaration calling for de facto as well as *de jure* equality between men and women, the integration of gender concerns into sustainable development, and a programme of action to achieve those goals.

As we prepare ourselves to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Organization next year, I sense that despite the frustration of our hopes after the end of the cold war, we are about to open a window on a future that truly does not belong to the nations of the North or the South, the West or the East, but to undivided humanity. Perhaps the advent of wisdom is always a gradual process. First we came to the realization that the human race could not survive in a state of cold war against itself; that our problems are global and systemic in nature, and thus that truly effective solutions to these

problems should be integral and so comprehensive they must be carried out by a global partnership.

Without that partnership, we should now realize, our bright hopes are unattainable. As we work to complete "An Agenda for Development" so as to match it with "An Agenda for Peace", we are actually etching the fine details of our common vision of a better and more unified world. It is said that the future belongs to those who have a clear vision of it. That may be so, but only if we are faithful to that vision, persevere in its pursuit, and thereby prove ourselves worthy of it.

**The President** *(interpretation from Spanish):* I now call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Georgia, His Excellency Mr. Alexander Chikvaidze.

**Mr. Chikvaidze** (Georgia): I should like to begin by extending my congratulations to Mr. Amara Essy on his election as President of the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session. It is a fitting acknowledgement of his considerable experience, as well as a tribute to his country's high standing in the international community.

I should also like to offer greetings and special words of gratitude to the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, for the attention and careful consideration he has accorded to my country's problems and for his selfless devotion to the cause of securing a safer and saner world for future generations. The Georgian people are looking forward with great anticipation to his forthcoming official visit to Georgia.

First of all, I would like to convey to the Assembly the greetings and best wishes for productive work from the Head of State and Chairman of the Parliament of the Republic of Georgia, Mr. Eduard Shevardnadze.

Just over two years have passed since the day I had the privilege of ushering my country into the United Nations as its one hundred seventy-ninth Member and addressing the Assembly from this rostrum. It was a moment of joy and celebration for my nation.

Many events have taken place in those two years, and they certainly cannot serve as a basis for euphoria and complacency.

My country has only recently set out on the arduous journey of building a democratic society. It is encountering numerous internal, as well as external, problems in its efforts. Despite fair and democratic elections and the forming of government structures, the country continues to languish in a deep economic and political crisis.

The international community has extended a helping hand to Georgia, and I should like to convey our appreciation and gratitude to the Governments of the United States of America, the Russian Federation, Germany, other States members of the European Union and Turkey, to name but a few, as well as to the United Nations and its specialized agencies, for their invaluable assistance to my country in times of hardship.

Granted, a large measure of the problems facing Georgia and all those nations which have only recently reverted to independence and normal development have domestic roots and must be addressed, first and foremost, by the countries themselves. But let us leave the internal aspect aside for the moment and concentrate on the international environment, of which these nations, as well as all other nations, are a part.

With the demise of the cold war the world underwent profound changes. The risk of an all-out nuclear catastrophe receded, and the world thus became a less dangerous place; but at the same time it became less stable and less predictable. The relationship between States and other actors on the international scene has changed, too.

The system of post-war international relations was tailored to the economic, political, ideological, geographic and other realities of that era. One of these realities was a deep realization of the fact that a totalitarian regime of the fascist variety had been defeated. Therefore, despite its major flaws, the post-war bipolar system generally responded to the demands of the times and somehow ensured security and stability on our planet.

Our generation witnessed the fall of another totalitarian regime with the downfall of communist ideology and of its followers. This resulted in deep changes in the nature of international relations. Different demands are being dictated by the times and different challenges are now facing the community of nations. This end of a whole era of human history, however, was not followed by the creation of a new system of international relations that would correspond to the realities of the contemporary world, as happened some 50 years ago. International political institutions, as well as political thought in general, found themselves unprepared

for the changes, and they continue to apply stop-gap measures to this very day.

Today's political leaders seem to have underestimated both the essence and the importance of these changes; hence the inability to cope with today's problems or with the challenges of the post-confrontational world. The infrastructure, principles, tools and mentality of international relations need to be adapted to the changed circumstances.

Therein lies the external aspect of the problems that the newly emerging independent States, including my own country, are facing. They are taking their first unsure steps on the road to a democratic society, a long and difficult road in a world that is still reeling from the nature of the changes and that realizes neither the extent of the predicament these nations face nor the stake it has in their existence and stable development.

Many of these nations, including my own, can, unfortunately, be described as "hot spots": they are the unhealed wounds that cover the body of our planet. These open wounds cry out for radical surgery, while the peace-keeping activities of the international community, despite its best efforts, tend in some cases to resemble cautious treatment with prescribed medication.

Perhaps, as I am the Foreign Minister of Georgia, it is not for me to complain about the deficiencies of the United Nations in terms of its peace-keeping activities. The Organization as a whole, its Security Council, Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali and his Special Envoy, Ambassador Brunner of Switzerland, have accorded a great deal of attention to the problems of my tormented country. On the issue of Georgia's Abkhazia region alone, nine Security Council resolutions have been adopted, numerous missions have been dispatched and the mandate of the United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG) has been extended. Alas, this has not proved to be sufficient. Clear decisions and bold, timely action are what the peoples of the world expect of the United Nations and of the Member States that make up the Organization.

In this regard, I would like to note how useful and timely the Georgian Government found the recent visit to Georgia of the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Ambassador Madeleine Albright. That visit also demonstrates the attention President Clinton attaches to events in Georgia.

While I would not want to belabour the issue of "hot spots," the predicament of my own country does not allow me to ignore this problem altogether. We would hate to think that yet another experiment is perhaps being conducted in Georgia, the result of which may well have a direct bearing on the security and sovereignty of other nations.

It is hard to describe the disappointment - and sometimes apathy - which the Georgian nation is feeling with regard to whether the international community will be able to promote a peaceful settlement of the Abkhazian conflict.

These feelings have created a dangerous and volatile political situation domestically. A wave of indignation is rising in Parliament and among the people at the inability to resolve this conflict - and the efforts to do so have been going on for more than a year now - and allow almost 300,000 displaced persons, who escaped physical extermination, to return to their homes and continue their lives.

At the heart of the Abkhazian conflict is an attempt by forces of aggressive separatism, bolstered by external support, to wrench a piece of territory away from a sovereign State and to create, in that part of Georgia, a provincial dictatorship based on ethnic hatred, intolerance and discrimination.

We appealed to the United Nations in the hope that it would be responsive to our desire to settle the conflict by peaceful means through a United Nations peace-keeping operation. But our hopes were only partially fulfilled. Despite almost a dozen resolutions of the Security Council, Member States could find neither the financial resources, the military contingents nor the political will to order a peace-keeping operation in Georgia.

Convinced of the possibility of a fair solution under the auspices of the United Nations, the Georgian Government has been negotiating with the separatists in good faith all this time under the auspices of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, with the Russian Federation as facilitator and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) as an observer. As a result, a number of agreements have been signed, which are designed to promote the return of the displaced persons to their homes and a settlement of the conflict.

But the bitter memory of a string of broken promises and unfulfilled obligations on the part of the separatists confirms how naive it is to expect a forthcoming position from a regime that conducts "ethnic cleansing" and genocide against the Georgian population. Predictably, the Abkhazian separatists are using far-fetched pretexts to continue ignoring their commitments under the agreements that have been signed.

Frustrated in its hopes for a United Nations peace-keeping operation in Abkhazia, the Government of the Republic of Georgia sent a similar appeal to the heads of the States members of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). A decision was reached and a CIS peace-keeping force was deployed in the zone of conflict. While its presence is beneficial and provides hope for a settlement, we feel that it could be more active and proceed beyond the stage of disengaging the parties in conflict.

The Abkhazian conflict is not a problem for Georgia alone. Believe me, I am not saying this in order to lay our problems at somebody else's doorstep. This conflict has direct and dangerous implications for the entire world. There are also compelling reasons why the world should be concerned with finding a solution to this problem.

Above all, we believe that the international community simply cannot act as an outside observer when a blatant attempt is being made against the sovereignty and territorial integrity of a Member State and when peace and stability are threatened. Allowing separatism to attain its goals in one country would set a precedent that could start a chain reaction throughout the world. And how many of us represented here today can safely say that their countries, their peoples, are immune from this danger?

And, lastly, the Caucasus is one of those areas in the world which have a geopolitical importance and bearing on the stability of large regions of the planet. The Caucasus is one of the world's few crossroads where North, South, East and West meet, and where continents, cultures, interests and strategies encounter one another. If peace and stability cannot be maintained in the Caucasus, they cannot be maintained anywhere.

In this regard, it is tragic that our closest neighbours, Armenia and Azerbaijan, have been unable to resolve their differences for so many years now. This conflict, too, tears at the fabric of the Caucasus and greatly increases the instability of the region, as well as the misery of hundreds of thousands of people.

It is my Government's firm position that the Abkhazian conflict can and should be resolved by peaceful means. A great deal of effort, delicate statesmanship and deep commitment are required from all sides.

The Georgian Government has to be very meticulous in elaborating a modern, workable and fair structure for its ethnically and culturally diverse population, a diversity which throughout the centuries has been a source of friendship, stability and pride, and never of tension or hatred. Most important, it has to create a strong economic base for its people, one that would prevent economic hardships from taking on a political and ethnic character.

Georgia will never accept the loss of any part of its territory. Not only because its territory is not large, but also because what it has is incontestably its own - every square inch of it. The leaders of the Abkhazian separatists have to realize this. They too have to find the political courage and will, the flexibility and the foresight, to negotiate in good faith and come to a settlement that would be fair and lasting, so that future generations of Georgians and Abkhazians could forget this one dark page in their fathers' lives and pick up in friendship and peace where their grandfathers left off.

The Russian Federation is an active participant in the process designed to find a peaceful solution to the Abkhazian conflict. It has taken on a great responsibility with regard to this peace process. We firmly believe that, despite the feelings of some political groups, the Russian Federation, as a great Power - and President Yeltsin, as the leader of that nation - does indeed want to see a strong, stable, sovereign, united and friendly Georgia on its southern border. Any other considerations would be contrary to logic. We are gratified that in his address to this Assembly a few days ago President Yeltsin alluded to this when he said that Russia's relations towards other States members of the Commonwealth of Independent States are based on good will and mutual benefit. In short, it is a time to think not about the mistakes of the past, but about the possibilities for the future.

Georgia has only recently joined the community of nations as a full-fledged member. And yet this period has been filled with events of great intensity and emotion for us. We feel an obligation to share our experience and thoughts in a number of areas which, we believe,

will contribute to the effectiveness of our collective efforts in the future.

We live in troubled times and are witness to rapid, unpredictable changes in the world. It is of paramount importance that contemporary political thought bring existing international institutions into conformity with the international political realities of today. It would seem that even such a representative body as the United Nations, if it is to continue to be ahead of events and fulfil its role as the parliament of man in a new situation, may have to effect some changes in its structure.

The reforms - prompted by the times - which the Organization is about to embark upon, the efforts of the Secretary-General to implement them, and the consent of the majority of the Member States are evidence that the time has come for a new era in international relations.

The number of Member States has more than doubled since the creation of the United Nations. We fully support the proposal to reflect these changes by increasing the numerical composition of the Security Council to 21, and we believe that the candidacies of Germany and Japan are appropriate for inclusion as new permanent members of the enlarged Security Council. Apart from reflecting the political and economic weight of these nations, this would also enable us finally to bring to a close the legacy of the Second World War and the cold war.

In considering the possibilities for increasing the number of permanent and non-permanent members of the Council, one of the main criteria, in our view, should be the involvement and role of member States in maintaining universal peace and stability. Although we see this consideration as a crucial one, other aspects, such as equitable geographical representation, should not be neglected either.

The task of creating a modern comprehensive system of ensuring peace and security in the world requires an increase in the effectiveness of the International Court of Justice, the main judicial body of the United Nations. We share the concern of the Secretary-General that the Court, the most important instrument for the settlement of disputes, is not being fully utilized for this purpose. More efficient use of the International Court would, undoubtedly, reinforce the ability of the United Nations to promote and strengthen peace. In this regard, we fully support the initiative of the Secretary-General to recognize the universal jurisdiction of the International Court, in accordance with Article 36 of its Statute, and on the basis of the recommendations put forward in the report of the Secretary-General entitled "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277).

Efforts aimed at creating a comprehensive system of international security can be effective today only if they are applied at both the global and the regional level. In our view, the ties between the global and regional security systems are inadequate for today's needs, and are maintained in a haphazard way. In this regard we consider it timely to raise the issue of achieving a higher level of interaction between global and regional security systems by concluding a series of special "form" treaties that will ensure more effective use, in close coordination, of their respective mechanisms.

Without prejudice to United Nations rules and regulations and to the provisions of the Charter, or to the statutes of the regional systems, these treaties should provide, *inter alia*, for regional organizations to exercise consultative and controlling functions on behalf, and on the authorization, of the United Nations.

In various international forums we often discuss the specific challenges of the post-confrontational world. Separatism, especially in its aggressive, extremist form, is one of the most dangerous of these challenges, and it is spreading like a cancer all over the planet. We believe that the creation of a legal basis for the containment of aggressive separatism is imperative and long overdue so that situations, such as the one in Georgia, will not flare up in other parts of the world in future, or if they do, they will be localized and defused in a timely manner.

We propose that clear provisions be inserted into international legal documents, outlawing aggressive, extremist separatism from its first stirrings. It is becoming more and more clear that the mere reiteration and confirmation of the principle of territorial integrity and the inviolability of borders is insufficient, all the more so since it is being flagrantly disregarded in many instances.

These legal provisions should also envisage a strict embargo on military deliveries and swift, surgical economic measures against separatist movements that have turned to armed struggle and violence, as well as a mechanism to use, in exceptional cases, the most decisive measure - military force.

The military forces for these operations could be set up in one of two ways: either United Nations stand-by

forces, an option which would entail considerable financial expense, or special well-trained units within the armed forces of each Member State which, when needed, could be put under the direct command of the United Nations Military Staff Committee, which itself could become more active and energetic.

While the second option seems more realistic at present, I would still like to stress the virtues of early preventive measures against such conflicts. Perhaps many of them could be localized and defused at an early stage, if the United Nations had relatively small, mobile forces of rapid reaction and deployment at its disposal. These forces could be made up on an international voluntary basis, thereby emphasizing their impartial and unbiased nature. They could be rapidly deployed in the conflict zone and, acting within a limited mandate, could ensure the disengagement of the conflicting parties in order to create the conditions for the deployment of a United Nations peace-keeping force.

In this regard, it would also seem indispensable to us to set up a special department within the United Nations Secretariat the sole purpose of which would be to work to resolve conflict situations. Ten highly experienced and respected political figures could form the nucleus of such a department. To perform their functions they would be vested with special rights and obligations.

Within such a department a special unit could be set up to coordinate the actions of the rapid deployment force. It would ensure the collection of information and intelligence data, and generally function as operations headquarters. The unit could also provide valuable early-warning information on potential conflict situations involving separatist tendencies.

To anticipate a natural question on the financing of such forces, I should say that, yes, it will undoubtedly entail additional financial, material means and human resources. This, however, is a case of the end clearly justifying the means. As we have paid a far greater price for being late so often in the past, the international community can no longer afford such a luxury.

A few days ago a proposal was made very forcefully from this rostrum that, in order to safeguard and uphold the rights of national minorities, the principles of the Declaration on the rights of national minorities should be embodied in the legislation of all member States. We firmly support the principle of providing national minorities with wide political, economic and cultural rights, and of ensuring civil and human rights for everyone. We would thus like to go a step further and propose to codify all aspects of this issue.

Since every right presumes a responsibility, we believe that it is imperative that international legal documents and national legislations of Member States, along with the rights of national minorities, also incorporate provisions on the responsibilities of these minorities towards the country of which they form a part.

In view of the rapidly growing role of individual leaders and personalities in international relations today, it would seem appropriate to us to consider also the issue of responsibility for an individual's role in the violation of human rights and liberties of persons, or groups of persons. Thus, we fully support the proposal to work out a declaration on the rights and responsibilities of individuals, groups and political bodies to ensure commonly accepted freedoms and human rights. It is precisely in this context that Georgia supported the creation of the post of United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights.

I have attempted to outline some of my Government's thoughts with regard to the changes that it thinks should be made in the structure and work of the Organization in view of the many profound changes in the international landscape today. While these are just some elements, a comprehensive and balanced vision of the needed changes is laid out by the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali in "An Agenda for Peace" and other documents. The implementation of the changes would go a long way towards eliminating many of the problems that we are discussing in this Hall and would also represent, as Mr. Eduard Shevardnadze put it so aptly, a very timely "blood transfusion" for the entire international system.

An important period is approaching in the life of the Organization. Next year we will be commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the United Nations. We have reached a mature age which allows us to take stock of the Organization's many accomplishments, but also one that obliges us to look ahead to what still needs to be done.

A half century of existence and experience confers even greater responsibility upon the Organization, as well as upon individual Member States. It imposes grander objectives, but also opens up wider horizons. Some of these objectives can be attained in our lifetime, while

others will be left to succeeding generations. It is our responsibility to provide a legacy which will serve as a stepping-stone for mankind to make a leap into the twenty-first century and land softly on solid ground.

Georgia is a small country, but it is a democratic country, and its foreign-policy objective is to have peaceful, friendly relations with all the nations of the world. Georgia will not be a passive observer of international events; it will carry its fair share of the responsibilities of the international community and make its contribution to achieving our common goals.

*The meeting rose at 1.40 p.m.*